

無師 — Derived Lessons, Volume I

Compiled 2026-08-31. 6 lessons generated by the KEGA gap-analysis pipeline over the mcp-sport corpus.

Every lesson here is *derived*. Each was produced from corpus gaps, each claim carries a citation to a retrieved passage, and **none has been trained by a human body.** Promotion to *body-validated* is a human act that no file in this volume can perform. Read them as hypotheses with their evidence attached, not as findings.

Contents

1. **Sen** — *taisabaki*五法, 8 passages, 2026-08-27
 2. **Ten** — *taisabaki*五法, 8 passages, 2026-08-27
 3. **how does a heel landing change a running man** — *mo-ting*, 8 passages, 2026-08-30
 4. **what do fighting systems agree on about stance, foot positi...** — *mo-ting*, 8 passages, 2026-08-30
 5. **what does praying mantis boxing teach about speed, ferocity...** — *praying mantis*, 8 passages, 2026-08-31
 6. **how is the au helicoptero performed, and what progression a...** — *capoeira*, 8 passages, 2026-08-31
-

1. Sen

*taisabaki*五法 · 8 passages · drafted 2026-08-27 · status *derived*

STATUS: *derived* — generated from corpus gaps. A hypothesis, not a finding. Nobody has tried this. Promotion to *body-validated* is a human act and this file cannot perform it.

What this teaches

You will learn to see, in your own sentai techniques, whether your blocking hand, your stepping leg, and your hip rotation start together or in a queue. By the end you will be able to watch a training partner throw a sentai chokujō zuki and name which of the three fired late. That single observation is what separates a Sen technique from a block followed by a punch.

Claim

In Sen, the defending hand, the leg insertion, and the hip rotation are one initiation rather than three — the defense and the attack are not sequenced, they are the same movement.

Evidence

Passage [1] states this directly and is the only passage that does: under *Sandō Ittai* ("three movements, one body"), it says that in sen-techniques the defending hand, the insertion of the leg, and the spinning of the hip should be *initiated at the same time*. Passage [7] corroborates from the other side, classifying the sentai family — chokujō zuki, tegatana/shutō uchi, tetchū ate, gyakusen ate — as techniques that "utilize the principle of attack and defense at once," which is the same simultaneity described as a category rather than as a coaching cue.

Passage [4] supplies the anatomical vocabulary the claim needs: Taïdo treats sen as one of five movement types (sen, un, hen, nen, ten), and asks the practitioner to account for the joints involved by type — hips and shoulders as ball-and-socket, elbows and knees as hinge, ankles spiral, neck and wrists pivot. Passage [2] gives the training order: on the spot (*tei-ten*), then on the line (*tei-sen*), then beyond — and explicitly argues that Taïdo techniques, unlike simpler punch-block-kick systems, do not become applicable without this graded sequence. Passage [5] places Sen first among the five movements and notes that Senin no Hokei is built around it.

What the passages do **not** support: [3] describes the nervous system in general terms (central, motor, sensory) and never mentions Sen, so any reaction-time argument built on it is my inference, not the text's. [6] describes *Tai-no-Sen*, *Go-no-Sen* and *Sen-no-Sen* — timing relative to an opponent's initiative — and nowhere connects these to Sen as a member of taisabaki五法; they matched by the word "sen" alone and I have not treated them as the same concept. [8] concerns breathing and keiraku and is irrelevant here. Because only [1] states the mechanic, the claim above is deliberately narrower than "Sen is simultaneity in all things."

Mechanism

The hip is a ball-and-socket joint [4], which means it can rotate the torso around a vertical axis while the leg beneath it is travelling. That is the structural permission the technique depends on. If the hip spin waits for the leg to land, the rotation has to be generated from a settled stance and the arm becomes a separate, second event; the body has done two things, and an opponent gets to respond between them.

Started together, the rotation does three jobs with one expenditure: it moves your centre off the incoming line (the defense), it carries the striking arm along its path (the attack), and it is what the inserted leg is being placed to receive. This is why [7] can classify sentai techniques as attack-and-defense-at-once as a *property of the technique* rather than as a skill level — the simultaneity is not a refinement added to a correct movement, it is the thing that makes the movement Sen rather than a block plus a punch. This also explains the training order in [2]: on the spot, the only variable is whether the three initiate together, so *tei-ten* isolates exactly the thing that is hard. Add travel too early and a late hip hides inside the footwork.

A plausible further reason — that one initiation costs one reaction latency where three cost three — follows from the motor/sensory description in [3], but [3] never says this about Sen and I am extending it. Treat it as a hypothesis, not as evidence.

Drill

Tei-ten simultaneity count. Work sentai chokujō zuki [7] on the spot, no travel [2].

- **5 sets of 6 reps = 30 scored reps per session, 3 sessions a week.**
- A partner watches from your open side and scores each rep pass/fail on one question only: did any of the three — hand, leg, hip — visibly start before the others? Any visible lead is a fail. Not "was it fast," not "was it strong."
- **Record the number of passes out of 30 every session.** That number is the drill; the reps are just how you generate it.
- Expect a low baseline — 8 to 14 out of 30 is normal for someone who has been training the components separately. **Target +2 per week.**
- **Gate:** only move from *tei-ten* to *tei-sen* (on the line) after scoring 24/30 or better in two consecutive sessions. When you move to the line, expect your score to drop by roughly a third; that drop is information, not regression.
- No partner: film from the open side at 60fps and score on playback. Slower, but the count is the same.

What you should now be able to do

You can now watch a sentai technique — yours on video, or a partner's live — and answer a specific question that you could not answer before: which of the three components led. You have a number attached to your own answer, and that number should move. What you should *not* claim to have gained is a general theory of Sen; what changed is that one diagnostic, on one technique family, with the training order that isolates it.

Limit

This lesson rests on **one passage**. Only [1] states the three-movements-one-initiation rule; [7] is consistent with it but is a classification list, not an instruction. Everything in Mechanism about *why* rotation permits simultaneity is my reading of the joint taxonomy in [4], which discusses joint types generally and never analyses a sentai technique.

The word "sen" is doing at least two jobs in this corpus. Passage [6] discusses Tai-no-Sen, Go-no-Sen and Sen-no-Sen — initiative timing against an opponent — and passages [1], [4], [5] and [7] discuss Sen as one of the five movements. **No passage here states that these are the same concept**, and I have not assumed they are. A reader who takes the simultaneity of Sandō Ittai as the same thing as Sen-no-Sen's "act at the same time as the opponent" is making a leap this evidence does not license. If the corpus contains the kanji for each, that ambiguity is resolvable; from these eight passages it is not.

The drill numbers are **not from the source**. The 30-rep count, the +2/week target, the 24/30 gate and the "8 to 14 baseline" are mine, constructed to make [1]'s cue countable and [2]'s *tei-ten* → *tei-sen* progression gated on something. No passage gives rep counts, session frequency, or any criterion for advancing between the stages, and I know of no trial testing whether trained simultaneity transfers to application. The 60fps filming suggestion is likewise mine.

Passage [5] states that *Senin no Hokei* was created "mainly for women" and grounds this in a yin/yang reading — while itself noting *hokei* are properly not divided by gender. I have used [5] only for the fact that Sen is first of the five movements. That gendered framing is the text's interpretation of its own tradition; nothing here tests it, and no claim in this lesson depends on it.

Finally: scope. This addresses one technique family (sentai *tsuki/uchi/ate*), on the spot, against a cooperative or absent opponent. Nothing here establishes what happens under

resistance, at *tenkai* range, or in the other four movements — un, hen, nen, ten — whose joint demands [4] explicitly says differ.

2. Ten

*taisabaki*五法 · 8 passages · drafted 2026-08-27 · status *derived*

STATUS: *derived* — generated from corpus gaps. A hypothesis, not a finding.
Nobody has tried this. Promotion to *body-validated* is a human act and this file cannot perform it.

What this teaches

By the end of this lesson you will be able to tell apart two failures that feel identical from the inside: a tentai technique that missed because the technique itself was wrong, and one that missed because the rotation carrying it was wrong. You will also have a count — not a feeling — that tells you when you have earned the removal of a spotter.

Claim

Ten is not learned as a new technique but as a new carrier for techniques you already own: *tengi* is built by re-attaching a familiar hand or leg technique to a rotating body, in graded assisted steps, not by drilling a novel strike.

Evidence

- [7] is the load-bearing passage. *Tenin no Hokei* is described as composed of *parts of previously learnt movements from each of the other hokei*, explicitly so that *tengi* can be learnt in a gradual manner. Its listed content is names of the form *tentai* + a technique that already exists elsewhere in the syllabus: *tentai ebi-geri*, *tentai zenten-zuki*, *tentai sha-zenten hangetsu-ate*. The naming convention is itself the evidence — the strike is not new, the carrier is.
- [2] gives the method. *Tengi* training means incorporating the development examples into existing leg techniques (kicking, twisting, sweeping, hitting) and hand techniques (punching, *nukite*, hitting), and it is the *completion* of that movement that counts as *tengi*. The same passage defines stepwise as easy-to-difficult with a specific focus on safety, systematic as linking related movements toward an advanced one, and states that assistance starts with two people and reduces to one.

- [1] names ten as one of five movement types and argues that because Taido moves five ways, every joint must be used according to its own kind — shoulders and hips ball-and-socket, elbows and knees hinge, ankles spiral, neck and wrists pivot. Ten is not given its own joints; it loads the same ones differently. This supports the carrier claim only indirectly.
- [4] supplies two working principles: that the out-of-balance state is where new technique comes from, and that one should develop accuracy rather than high speed. Neither is stated about Ten specifically.
- [5] is *not* tengi. It is gohō-ate — four counted directions of elbow strike with the right foot kept on the kidō-ten. It is used below for the fixed-axis idea only, and that is an analogy, not evidence.
- [6] supplies the rep bands used in the drill: 5–10 repetitions on one side from hidari chūdan-gamae, and 4–8 repetitions alternating left and right on the spot using ten-soku. The excerpt does not show which of the gohō those numbered items belong to; the only labelled heading visible is Ungi, which comes *after* them. Treat these as this corpus's house range for on-the-spot repetition, not as a prescribed tengi dose.
- [3] is general upper-limb mechanics — elbow flexion in defence, wrist snap, reach limits. No Ten content.
- [8] is a retrieval false positive. It concerns the purpose of Taido training in general, and its "ten" is the numeral in a proverb about ten people's eyes, not the gohō Ten. It carries no weight here.

What the passages do not support: none of them defines what Ten physically *is*. No passage states its axis, its geometry, or how it differs mechanically from un, hen or nen. I inferred rotation only from the *tentai* prefix in [7]. The Claim is therefore restricted to training order, which is documented, and says nothing about the movement's shape, which is not.

Mechanism

Attaching a known technique to rotation changes exactly one variable: the reference frame. The joint work is unchanged — the elbow is still a hinge, the wrist still snaps [3] — but its orientation to the ground, and the moment at which it may fire, are now dictated by the body's rotation rather than by the floor. Introduce a new technique on a new carrier and you change two variables at once, at which point a failed repetition tells you nothing, because you cannot say whether the limb or the rotation was at fault.

Holding the technique fixed is what makes the repetition diagnostic. This is why [7]'s hokei is assembled from movements you have already learnt rather than from fresh ones.

Second, rotation is a deliberate loss of balance, and [4] locates the chance to create technique precisely in that out-of-balance state. But a body already committed to rotation has nothing to push against and cannot re-aim mid-flight. The aim must therefore be set *before* stability is surrendered — which is why accuracy has to precede speed here rather than follow it, and why [4]'s general preference becomes a hard constraint once the technique is carried.

Third, the assistants. Attention is finite, and a body that expects to hit the floor spends its attention on the floor. Two assistants remove the landing consequence so that attention can go to the technique; reducing to one, then to none, returns that consequence in measured steps [2]. The spotters are not a safety accessory bolted onto the drill — they are the variable being trained down.

Drill

Choose **one** technique you already perform correctly standing — a zuki or an ebi-geri. It does not change for six weeks.

Set a fixed target at a fixed height: a held pad, or a mark on the wall. Every repetition scores hit or miss against that target. Accuracy is the number that gates progression; speed is not trained at all until week 6 [4].

Baseline, before week 1: 10 repetitions per side, standing, no rotation, against the target. If you do not score 9 of 10 on both sides, the technique is not ready to be carried and the rest of this drill is wasted on it.

Then, from hidari chūdan-gamae, attach that same technique to the tentai entry and work on the spot, alternating sides.

Week	Reps per side	Alternating sets	Assistants	Gate to advance
1–2	5	4	2	4/5 on target both sides, with no assistant taking your weight
3	7	5	2	6/7 both sides, held across two consecutive sessions
4	7	6	1	6/7 both sides with a single assistant
5	10	6	1	8/10 both sides, and the assistant reports no contact made
6	10	8	0	8/10 unassisted — only now may speed be raised

Two numbers move week over week: the repetition count (5 → 10 per side, 4 → 8 alternating sets) and the assistant count (2 → 1 → 0). If a gate fails, repeat the week rather than carrying the failure forward. The assistant count is the one number in this drill whose gate has a physical cost when you get it wrong.

The bands 5–10 and 4–8 are taken from [6]. The week-by-week ladder between them, the target-accuracy gate, and the baseline test are my construction, not the textbook's.

What you should now be able to do

You can now read a failed tentai repetition instead of merely repeating it: because the technique is held constant across all six weeks, a miss points at the rotation, and a technique that degrades only under rotation points at the timing of the release rather than at the limb. You have a spotter-removal decision that rests on a scored count rather than on your own sense of readiness. What you do not have from this is a model of the movement's shape — you have a way to train it, not a description of it.

Limit

This establishes nothing about what Ten physically is. No passage in this set defines its axis or its mechanics; the rotational reading comes from my inference off the *tentai* prefix in the technique names in [7], and could be wrong.

The evidence is one textbook — Taido Kyohan, three volumes — in translation, and several of the retrieved excerpts are mangled by OCR (the numerals in [6] and [7] arrive as glyph names). It is a single school stating its own doctrine. There is no sample, no

trial, no outcome data, and no comparison against any other way of teaching tengi. Nothing here shows that graded assisted practice produces better tengi than the alternative; it shows only that this textbook prescribes it.

Three specific weaknesses to hold onto. The assistant sequence in [2] is cut off mid-sentence — the text stops at "once the movement", so the actual criterion for reducing from two spotters to one is *not* in evidence, and my "no assistant taking your weight" gate is invented to fill that hole. The rep bands from [6] are not attributed to Ten anywhere in the excerpt; the only labelled section in it is Ungi. And [5], which supplies the fixed-axis intuition, is a four-direction elbow-strike drill, not a tengi drill at all.

Everything in the Drill beyond those two number bands is my interpolation and has not been tested on anyone.

3. how does a heel landing change a running man

mo-ting · 8 passages · drafted 2026-08-30 · status *derived*

STATUS: *derived* — generated from corpus gaps. A hypothesis, not a finding. Nobody has tried this. Promotion to *body-validated* is a human act and this file cannot perform it.

What this teaches

You will be able to hear the difference between two running man reps that look identical. By the end you will know which part of your foot is carrying each beat, why the heeled rep costs you the next one, and how to spend a heel landing on purpose instead of collecting it by accident when you tire.

Claim

A heel landing in the running man is not a change of foot shape but a change of state — it drops the raised, spring-loaded heel that four separate striking systems treat as the precondition for immediate weight transfer, converting a travelling beat into an impact beat you must re-push out of.

Evidence

Five of the eight passages describe the same detail from three unrelated lineages, which is the strongest thing on offer here.

- [1] is the only passage that gives the heel a stated function rather than a position. The rear heel sits about a quarter to half an inch off the floor; it is called a *spring*, it lets you switch weight to the other foot immediately when punching, and it gives way to blows from any angle. Critically, [1] also says the heel *drops at the impact of the blow*, and refuses any universal rule about raised or flat heels.
- [4], same source, attaches the raised heel to continuous movement rather than to a pose: keep it raised while retreating, stay light on your feet continuously.
- [6] (AIBA boxing) repeats the detail independently, and does so inside a variation where the arms have been moved entirely — the rear heel stays slightly raised anyway. The detail survives changes to everything above it.
- [3] and [8] (IMBA Muay Thai) show the heel-up foot doing the *driving*, not just staying light: in all four techniques listed, the forefoot presses downward and the support leg straightens. Force is generated through the ball of the foot.
- [2], [5] and [7] are not evidence. They are wrestling back-heel trips — a different sense of the word, describing an obstacle placed behind an opponent's heel. [5] is a pleasing analogy (a heel set behind a rushing man's heel stops his rush) but it is an analogy, and I am not counting it.

What the corpus does not contain: nothing here mentions the running man, running gait, dance, tricking, or landing at all. The retrieval matched on *heel* and *raised*, not on *landing*. So the claim above is deliberately weaker than it could be — it says the heeled rep loses the described spring function, not that heel landings are wrong.

Mechanism

The raised heel is a pre-tensioned ankle. Holding the forefoot down keeps the calf and Achilles loaded before contact, so the landing impulse goes into a structure that can return it — [1]'s "spring... giving in to blows," and [3]/[8]'s forefoot press as the actual source of drive. Weight sits over or slightly ahead of the base, so the next beat needs only a release.

A heel landing inverts all three. Contact happens ahead of your mass, through an ankle that is dorsiflexed and has nothing stored; the ground reaction force points backward through a comparatively straight leg. That is braking. The impulse does not come back —

it passes up into knee and hip and is spent. Your mass must then be re-accelerated by muscle, which is one extra effort per rep, which is why the tempo ceiling drops before the legs feel tired. The heel also grips: the slide that makes the running man read as travel stops the moment the heel bites.

This is why [1] matters more than it first appears. The heel is *supposed* to drop at impact. It is the rooting position. So the heeled rep is not a broken rep — it is a stop, arriving on a beat you meant to travel through.

	Forefoot rep (travelling)	Heel rep (rooting)
Contact point vs. hip	under or just behind	ahead of it
Ankle at contact	plantarflexed, pre-loaded	dorsiflexed, slack
Landing impulse	stored in calf/Achilles, returned	passed to knee and hip, spent
Cost of the next beat	a release	a re-push
Sound	near-silent	audible tap
Slide	continues	grips and stops
Good for	every beat that keeps going	the beat you intend to end on

Drill

Silent running man, against a metronome, counting only silent reps. One rep = one full foot exchange, one rep per click. A heel that touches is audible and you will feel it as a jolt at the hip; count that rep as a miss. Tape a 60 cm box on the floor — drifting out of it is the same fault showing up as braking rather than sound.

Open each session with **5 deliberately heel-landed reps** so you know what you are avoiding, and close each set with **1 rooted rep** on the last count — heel down, on purpose, as a stop. Between sets, check the raise statically: lay a pencil flat under your rear heel at the top of the position; it should slide free (a pencil is roughly the quarter inch [1] specifies).

Week	Tempo	Volume	Gate to advance
1	100 bpm	3 × 20	18/20 silent, all sets, two sessions running
2	110 bpm	3 × 24	22/24 silent, no drift out of the box
3	120 bpm	4 × 24	23/24 silent, clean rooted rep closing each set
4	130 bpm	4 × 30	28/30 silent and pencil slides free after the final set

The week 4 gate is the real one. Heels come down when you are tired, so a raise you can only produce fresh has not transferred yet.

What you should now be able to do

You can now identify a heel landing without watching your feet — it is the rep with a sound and a jolt, and the rep after it feels heavier because you paid to restart your own mass. You can hold a tempo and see where in the set your heels start arriving, which is a fatigue reading rather than a style note. And you can put a heel down deliberately to end a phrase, which is a different act from letting one arrive.

Limit

No passage in this corpus is about the running man, about running, about dance or tricking, or about landing from any height. All eight matched on the word *heel*, and three of them ([2], [5], [7]) use it in an unrelated sense — wrestling trips — and were discarded. Everything above is transfer from stationary and striking footwork to a moving landing, which is my inference and not the sources'.

There is no measurement anywhere in the evidence: no force plates, no tempo data, no sample of practitioners, no fatigue study. Bruce Lee's quarter-to-half inch is one man's published prescription, not a tested range, and [1] itself explicitly refuses a hard rule on heel position, listing body position and reaction to attack as reasons it varies. The elastic-return account in Mechanism is ordinary biomechanics, but nothing in these eight passages tests it. Untested here: whether a silent rep actually correlates with better performance, whether the drill's tempo ceiling moves at all over four weeks, and whether heel landings carry any injury cost — that last claim is not made and should not be read in.

4. what do fighting systems agree on about stance, foot position and the drills that train th

mo-ting · 8 passages · drafted 2026-08-30 · status *derived*

STATUS: *derived* — generated from corpus gaps. A hypothesis, not a finding. Nobody has tried this. Promotion to *body-validated* is a human act and this file cannot perform it.

What this teaches

By the end of this you will be able to look at a stance — yours in a mirror, or a partner's across the floor — and read what range it was built for, before either of you moves. You will also be able to feel the moment your own feet have committed you to a range you did not choose, which is the moment most people mistake for "being ready." Mo-ting has never written this down, so you are getting it from outside the system.

Claim

Three unrelated fighting systems treat stance as a distance setting rather than a posture — each names variants indexed to range, and every fault they list is a fault of mobility or balance, never of appearance.

Evidence

The AIBA boxing manual does not teach *a* stance; it teaches at least three, and sorts them by the distance the boxer intends to work at. The rear-weighted stance is explicitly for long-range, defensive, counter-punching work, and the manual states its purpose plainly: the lead foot and lead hand become measuring instruments, and weight can be dumped forward onto the lead foot to enter range faster than the opponent can set a defence [1]. The medium-distance stance is a compression of the same frame — upper body rotated inward, both elbows drawn to the ribs, hands to the chin — for a boxer who already has combinations and counters [3]. The frontal stance goes the other way for short range: weight even on both legs, both feet pointing forward, knees bent, hands at the chin, chosen for boxers with strong quick punches from both arms [4].

The manual's list of common stance faults is the strongest single piece of evidence here, because every entry names a *cost*, not a standard: feet too wide hinders rapid movement, feet too narrow disturbs balance, both heels flat hinders fluent movement, standing

straight up enlarges the target, lifting the chin exposes a knockout point [5]. Not one fault is cosmetic.

Taekwondo arrives at the same place from a different direction. Its grading syllabus lists stances as named positions and grades "correct foot positions, balance and control" as an examinable item at a 60% success threshold, rising to 80% at higher grades [2, 7]. Partner practice is described in terms of distance adjustment, technique timing and step exercises [7] — the feet are trained against a moving person, not held in air.

Bruce Lee's material makes the underlying principle explicit rather than implicit: footwork is what lets you control the precise distance between you and the opponent, and the strategy is to read his pattern of advancing and retreating and adjust the length of your own step to it [6]. Elsewhere the same source notes that the opponent's foot can be *contained* by where you place your own [8] — so foot position is not only self-support, it is a constraint imposed on someone else.

	Long range [1]	Medium range [3]	Short range [4]
Weight	Shifted toward rear leg	(unstated in source)	Even on both legs
Feet	Lead flat, rear rotated slightly inward	(unstated in source)	Both pointing forward, lead flat
Knees	Rear knee bent slightly	(unstated in source)	Both bent slightly
Upper body	Face square to opponent	Rotated slightly inward	Rotated slightly to rear side
Hands	Lead arm used to measure distance	Both elbows tucked, hands to chin	Elbows tucked, hands to chin
Bought with it	Reach, exit, one-beat entry	Combinations, counters	Two-handed power, no travel

The gaps in the middle column are real. Passage [3] describes the medium stance only as a modification of the classic stance and never restates the footwork, so the corpus does not tell you what the feet do at medium range. Treat that column as unknown rather than as "the same."

Mechanism

This works because a stance is a standing trade between base size and time-to-move, and range decides which side of that trade you want.

Any step begins by unweighting a foot. A foot carrying half your mass cannot leave the floor until that mass goes somewhere else, and moving it takes a beat that is visible. So the wider your feet, the more mass sits between them and the longer the unweighting takes — which is exactly why the manual calls wide feet a hindrance to rapid movement rather than a matter of style [5]. Narrow the feet and you shorten that transfer, but you also shrink the base: any push, from you or into you, now has a longer moment arm relative to your support, and you get the balance fault [5]. Flat heels are the same argument one level down — a heel already off the floor has completed the first part of its push; a flat heel has to lift before it can drive, and that lift is another beat [5].

Rear-weighting is this trade taken deliberately. Put the weight back and the lead foot is nearly free: it can extend to measure without committing you [1], and when you do commit, the weight falls onto a foot that is already placed, so entry costs one beat instead of two [1]. That is why it suits long range — at long range you need to *travel*, and travel is the thing you are buying. At short range you are not travelling, so you spend nothing on it: even weight, both feet forward, and you buy two-handed power instead [4]. The taekwondo grading logic is the same principle written as an examination — foot position and balance are scored because they are what makes the rest of the technique repeatable, and the threshold rises from 60% to 80% as the syllabus assumes the feet have stopped being the limiting factor [2, 7].

The reason to read range off someone else's feet follows directly. If stance encodes the range the person intends to work at, then their stance is a declaration of intent that they cannot easily hide, because it is load-bearing. And because their available steps are constrained by where their weight sits, placing your own foot against theirs removes options from a list you can already see [6, 8].

Drill

Two drills. Both are countable, and both numbers should move week over week — one up, one down.

Drill A — called switches. A partner calls "long," "medium," or "short" at random. You move from wherever you are into that stance. One switch is *clean* if the lead foot lands flat, the rear heel stays light, and you arrive in a single weight transfer — no shuffle, no double-step, no rise. Your partner counts clean switches out of the calls made. Score as a percentage.

Drill B — pattern read. Your partner advances and retreats on a fixed pattern they choose privately (e.g. two forward, one back). You mirror at distance and call the pattern

aloud as soon as you have it. Count the number of their steps before your correct call. This number should fall.

Week	Drill A volume	Gate to advance	Drill B target
1	3 × 20 called switches, calls every 3 s	60% clean	correct call within 20 steps
2	3 × 20, calls every 2 s	70% clean	within 16 steps
3	3 × 30, calls every 2 s	80% clean	within 12 steps
4	3 × 30, partner closing distance while calling	80% clean under pressure	within 8 steps

Do not advance a row until the gate is met twice in separate sessions. If your Drill A percentage falls when the partner starts closing in week 4, that is the drill working — it means the earlier weeks were scoring your memory of the stance rather than your feet.

The 60% and 80% gates are borrowed from taekwondo's grading thresholds for technique execution [2, 7]. The volumes, the intervals and every number in Drill B are mine. No passage in this corpus specifies a rep count for stance training, so those figures are constructed to be trackable, not validated.

What you should now be able to do

You should now be able to name the range a stance is built for by looking at where the weight sits and where the feet point, and to say what that stance bought and what it gave up — reach and a one-beat entry, or two-handed power with no travel. You should be able to feel the extra beat in your own movement when your feet are too wide or both heels are down, because you now know what that beat is being spent on. What you cannot yet do is trust the middle of the range: the corpus describes the medium-distance stance only from the ribs up, so for now you are reading long and short with evidence and guessing at what lies between.

Limit

No passage in this corpus describes mo-ting. Nothing here is evidence about your system; it is evidence about three others, and whether it transfers is an open question this lesson does not touch.

The sample is eight passages from three books, and it is not balanced: four come from a single AIBA boxing manual, two from a taekwondo grading guide, two from Bruce Lee. "Three systems agree" therefore rests on one source per system, and the boxing source carries half the weight. None of the three authors cites the others — the agreement is my reading across them, not a convergence any of them claimed.

None of the material is empirical. The boxing manual is prescriptive coaching text: it asserts that wide feet hinder movement and that flat heels hinder fluency, but it measures nothing, gives no timings, and reports no comparison [5]. My beat-cost mechanism is a physical argument built on those assertions, not a finding — it is the most likely explanation for why the faults are faults, and it has not been tested. The taekwondo 60%/80% figures are pass marks for examined technique execution [2, 7]; they are not evidence that stance drilling transfers to sparring, and I have repurposed them as drill gates on nothing stronger than their plausibility as thresholds.

The corpus also never says what happens under contact. Every stance description assumes a boxer standing free [1, 3, 4]; the foot-containment idea [8] is a single sentence with a photo reference I cannot see. The medium-range footwork is simply absent. And the drill progression above has never been run by anyone — it was written for this lesson and has no history behind it.

5. what does praying mantis boxing teach about speed, ferocity and the spirit behind the tech

praying mantis · 8 passages · drafted 2026-08-31 · status `derived`

STATUS: `derived` — generated from corpus gaps. A hypothesis, not a finding. Nobody has tried this. Promotion to `body-validated` is a human act and this file cannot perform it.

Probe provenance. The question came from a CCTV-4 documentary on 于海 (Yu Hai), Meihua Northern Mantis lineage — first 13:00 of 51:56, machine-transcribed at Whisper `small`. That transcript is `trust: auto` and mangles proper nouns (it renders 螳螂拳 as 唐郎拳 and 于海 as 余海). **Nothing below is quoted from it.** It supplied the question; the corpus carries every claim.

What this teaches

You will be able to say what praying mantis boxing is *for*, not merely which hand shapes it uses. And you will be able to spot a more general failure: a book that hands you a complete mechanism while quietly withholding the condition under which the mechanism is worth attempting.

Claim

The corpus teaches mantis as a geometry of contact and specifies it to unusual depth, but none of the eight retrieved passages state the condition under which a practitioner should commit that geometry against a stronger opponent — which is the first thing the lineage names.

Evidence

The mechanism is documented thoroughly, and from two independent systems.

- [1] (Northern) gives the organising pair: whip-like and circular motions deflect a direct attack, followed into vital points, under the rubric of *"removing something"* (blocking to create a gap) and *"adding something"*.
- [2] (Southern) makes the circle total — *"whole circles, half-circles, quarter circles, circling in and circling out, circling high and circling low... circles are everything and everywhere."*
- [6] specifies **three distances** and **three heights** — floor, medium, upper — as separate fighting problems rather than one posture.
- [5] puts two-man work at the foundation: sticky elbows, hooking hands, two-man body conditioning, *"sticky-feeling-controlling"* exercises.
- [7] records the transmission method — memorised **songs** carrying fighting theory, so the student holds it without a book.
- [8] even documents a refusal: the skilled practitioner *"won't block for defence, though he will follow through with his own punch,"* resolving contact through *guen* and what follows.
- [4] records the style taxonomy and lineages (Long Fist Mantis, Throwing Hand Meihua Mantis).

So the record is not thin. It is a complete description of **how**.

What it does not contain is when. The single passage that reaches toward disposition — [3] — lands on conduct toward teachers: *"Respect the ancient Masters, Respect the*

Master, Respect and Cherish your Teacher and Teachings." That is an ethic of study, not an instruction for the moment a smaller fighter decides to close on a larger one. The lineage answer to the same question is 螳臂當車 — the mantis raising its forelimbs against an oncoming chariot, outmatched by an absurd margin and advancing anyway.

Mechanism

Why the omission is structural rather than accidental: every item the corpus *does* teach is **decomposable into positions and counts**. A circle can be drawn. A range can be measured. A sticky-hands drill has two people and a start position. 螳臂當車 has none of these — it is not a movement but a **decision about acceptable odds**, taken before any movement begins.

A syllabus is a list of things that can be demonstrated and corrected. A disposition cannot be corrected, only reported. So the phrase survives in the tradition as an image, gets named in every introduction, and drops out of every exercise list — not because it is secret, but because the format cannot hold it.

This is the same hole as the dragon in 無身, arrived at from the opposite direction. The dragon resists instruction because the language presupposes parts and a dragon has none. 螳臂當車 resists it because there is nothing to move.

Drill

There is no countable drill, and the claim is not yet a lesson.

The corpus supplies no exercise for commitment-under-disadvantage, and inventing one — "spar a heavier partner three rounds a week" — would be background knowledge wearing a citation's clothes, which is the exact failure this pipeline exists to prevent. What can be counted is the *precondition*: [5]'s two-man sticky-hands work is drillable and is in the corpus. Whether repetitions of it produce the disposition is unestablished and is the open question, not the answer.

Limit

- **Eight passages is a sample, not the corpus.** "*Absent from the retrieved passages*" is not "*absent from the collections*." A probe for 螳臂當車 in Chinese has not been run, and the Chinese commentarial tradition has not been read.

- **Retrieval mixed Northern and Southern Mantis** — different systems with different lineages. The mechanism evidence is therefore stronger than any claim that one specific system omits the disposition.
- **Only the first 25% of the source video** was transcribed, at `small`. The remaining 39 minutes are unread, so this may be Yu Hai's personal emphasis rather than the lineage's.
- **Nothing here has been trained**, by me or anyone. See Drill.

open	what would settle it
Is 螳臂當車 untaught, or merely unretrieved?	probe the corpus in Chinese for 螳臂當車 and 勇猛快速
Does <i>any</i> system train commitment-under-disadvantage?	probe across all 16 categories, not just mantis
Is this Yu Hai's emphasis or the lineage's?	transcribe the remaining 39:00 at <code>medium</code>

Sources: `Northern_Praying_Mantis` [1,4]; `Southern_Praying_Mantis` [2,3,5,6,7,8].
 Retrieval: `kega-ask.py` — verdict ANSWERABLE, 8/8 mentioning, ratio 1.0. Probe transcript: `HE5da1RWR3E` 0:00–13:00.

6. how is the au helicoptero performed, and what progression and errors are involved

capoeira · 8 passages · drafted 2026-08-31 · status `derived`

STATUS: `derived` — generated from corpus gaps. A hypothesis, not a finding. Nobody has tried this. Promotion to `body-validated` is a human act and this file cannot perform it.

Probe provenance. Capoeira — Tutorial Au Helicóptero, Move4Freedom (`40uRa17PfIE`, 6:36). **Manual captions** — `trust: manual`, so the video is **quotable source**, not merely an index. This is the first lesson in the ledger where a video is cited as evidence rather than used only to supply the question.

What this teaches

You will be able to state the difference between a movement being *documented* and being *teachable*, using a case where both records exist side by side. And if you train the helicóptero, you will have a five-stage progression and four named errors that the reference book does not contain.

Claim

The corpus documents the helicóptero completely as a **destination** — what the finished movement looks like and what to keep straight — and contains none of the progression, scaffolding, or error layer needed to arrive at it; on the one point where both sources speak, the practitioner source **contradicts** the widely taught cue.

Evidence

The book has the movement. *Capoeira 100* names it twice. [8] defines it — "*a rotating twist from aú that drives forward a kick in an inverted position*" — with the pointer "*keep the legs as straight as possible at all stages.*" [5] adds the trajectory: it "*begins naturally with what seems to be a simple aú west, but then this spins and pushes through into a kick pointing east.*" The surrounding entries situate it in a full technical vocabulary — aú normal, aú compasso [7], bananeira and its variants [1,3] — and the book advertises itself as "*a step-by-step guide to 100 techniques and 100 exercises*" [4].

So this is not a gap in coverage. The movement is present, correctly described, and illustrated.

What the book does not contain is how to get there. All eight passages describe positions and finished shapes. None describes a sequence of attempts, a partial success, or a failure.

The video supplies all three:

- **A limiting factor, named first.** "*This movement is a back movement... the elasticity of our back will be very involved.*" The book's pointer is about the legs; the practitioner's first instruction is about the back.
- **An entry correction.** "*We will enter backwards, and not to the side as in the basic au.*" Lateral entry is possible "*but it is much more complicated, and requires much more elasticity in the back.*"
- **A five-stage progression:** (1) the backward entrance; (2) the turn, where "*at first, it is normal falling to the ground... it is part of the process*"; (3) landing on the feet and

one hand; (4) standing up with both feet together; (5) finishing on one leg with the turn.

- **A scaffold with a decreasing variable.** Perform it starting from a raised surface "so that the legs end lower" — which reduces the back elasticity required — then "gradually do it with less height, and finally doing it on the ground."
- **An aesthetic error with a mechanical cause.** "The head must be left behind to facilitate the curvature in your back... with the head forward the aesthetic is completely broken."

And a direct contradiction. On the height of the turn the two sources disagree, and the video knows it is disagreeing: "Many people teach the helicopter taking as a reference hitting something with the foot, near the ground, but after much analysis, I verify that this method is not efficient because it costs much more to make the movement with the leg near the ground." Its instruction is the opposite — "making the turn as high as possible."

Mechanism

Why the book stops where it does is structural, not lazy. *Capoeira 100* is organised as one hundred entries, each a movement with pointers. That format has a slot for **what correct looks like** and no slot for **what the fourth attempt looks like**. An error layer is not a hundred-and-first technique; it is a different axis entirely, and adding it would multiply the book rather than extend it.

The progression is missing for the same reason. A progression is not a description of a movement but a description of a *learner over weeks* — it needs a time axis the reference format does not have. So the book records the destination faithfully and drops the road, and every reference work of this shape will do the same.

This generalises: **where a corpus is organised by technique, the error layer is not thin, it is structurally absent**. That is the reason the `errors` column in the Mo Shiao table stands at 0 of 26 — not an oversight in the extraction, a property of the sources.

Drill

Countable, and it comes from the video, not from me.

Stage the height, not the reps. Perform the helicóptero from a raised surface, and record the height in centimetres as the number that moves week over week. Start at a height where you can complete stage (3) — landing on both feet and one hand. Hold that height

until you can finish on **one leg with the turn** three times in a session, then drop the height and repeat.

- Week-over-week number: **surface height, decreasing.**
- Terminal condition: height = 0, finishing on one leg.
- Expect stage (2) failures throughout — *"it is normal falling to the ground... it is part of the process."*

Secondary check, from the contradiction above: film one set turning **high** and one turning **low**. The video's claim is that low costs more. That is a testable claim and nobody in this ledger has tested it.

Limit

- **This establishes a gap in one book, not in capoeira.** *Capoeira 100* is a reference work and behaves like one. A pedagogy text, or a teacher, may carry the progression — neither was retrieved because neither is in the corpus.
- **The contradiction is unresolved.** One practitioner's *"after much analysis"* is not evidence against a widely taught cue. It is a hypothesis with a named disagreement, which is more than the corpus offers but less than a finding.
- **Single source for the entire progression.** Everything in the Drill traces to one video by one practitioner. No second capoeira source corroborates the five stages or the height scaffold.
- **Nothing here has been trained.** See the ledger status.

open	what would settle it
High turn vs low turn — which actually costs less?	film both, count completions per attempt
Is the five-stage progression general or personal?	probe a second capoeira teaching source
Do other movement corpora omit the error layer the same way?	run the same probe on breaking, tricking, gymnastics [collections already present]

Sources: `Capoeira_100...` [1,3,4,5,6,7,8] — [2] is front matter and is not counted as evidence. Retrieval: `kega-ask.py` — verdict ANSWERABLE, 8/8 mentioning, ratio 1.0. Practitioner source: `4OuRa17PfIE`, manual captions.